



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,662	04/14/2004	Dany Sylvain	7000-339	7528
27820	7590	04/11/2007	EXAMINER	
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.			LU, ZHIYU	
100 REGENCY FOREST DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 160			2618	
CARY, NC 27518				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/11/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/824,662	SYLVAIN, DANY
	Examiner Zhiyu Lu	Art Unit 2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding rejections on claims 1 and 19, Applicant has argued that Fukushima does not teach “a first interface in the mobile terminal and adapted to facilitate communications via a wired connection to a first communication network”, but teach a personal computer that has to use a docking station to establish communication with an external device.

However, Fukushima teaches a laptop having wireless connection capability to communicate with an access point and wired connection capability to communicate with the access point (Figs. 4-6). Regardless how the laptop connects with the access point, it demonstrates “adapted to facilitate communications via a wired connection.” Also, according to Fig. 3 of Applicant’s filed Application, Applicant’s mobile terminal too connects to LAN via a docking station.

Regarding rejections on claims 3, 8 and 21, Applicant has argued that Fukushima does not inherently “communications via the first interface are associated with a first address and communications via the second interface are associated with a second address” since Fukushima teaches neither assigning IP address nor a connection with a router but with an access point.

However, it’s well known in the art that different interfaces have different MAC addresses. So the wireless and wired interfaces of the laptop are already inherently

associated with different addresses. Also, whether the access point is a router or not, it gives addresses to the wireless and wired interfaces of the laptop.

Regarding rejections on claims 4-7 and 22-25, Applicant has argued that Fukushima does not teach “registering with a service node.”

However, Fukushima teaches connection with an access point (65 of Figs. 5-6), which is considered registering with a service node.

Regarding rejections on claims 18 and 36, Applicant has argued that it is not obvious to combine Fukushima and Frelburger et al.

However, Frelburger et al. teach a portable computing device, not just a PDA but also possibly a laptop computer (column 4 lines 19-44) having cellular communication capability for telephony services (column 7 lines 8-10), which is obvious to combine with the laptop computer of Fukushima for providing telephony communication capability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 and 19-35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukushima (US2002/0038400) in view of Cherry et al. (US2005/0198069).

Regarding claim 1, Fukushima teaches a mobile terminal comprising:

- a) a first interface in the mobile terminal and adapted to facilitate communications via a wired connection to a first communication network (19 of Fig. 4);
- b) a second interface in the mobile terminal and adapted to facilitate local wireless communications via a second communication network (8 of Fig. 4); and
- c) a control system operatively associated with the first and second interfaces and adapted to:

select the first interface for establishing the communication sessions over the first communication network, when the wired connection via the first interface is available (Figs. 5-6, paragraph 0090).

But, Fukushima does not expressly disclose establish communication sessions associated with a first indicia over the first and second communication networks via the first and second interfaces.

Cherry et al. teach a laptop connects to a network with a given user ID via wired or wireless connection, which would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the user ID remains the same every time registering with an access point in different sessions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate providing user ID to log on network taught by Cherry et al. into the mobile terminal of Fukushima, in order to provide security and user identification.

Regarding claim 19, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach a method as explained in response to claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19

Fukushima teaches the control system is further adapted to determine if the wired connection via the first interface is available (paragraph 0090).

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Fukushima teaches communications via the first interface are associated with a first address and communications via the second interface are associated with a second address (inherent in MAC addresses).

Regarding claims 4 and 22, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 3 and 21.

Fukushima teaches the control system is further adapted to register with a service node in association with the first address when the wired connection via the first communication interface is available (Fig. 5, paragraph 0090).

Regarding claims 5 and 23, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 4 and 22.

Fukushima teaches the control system is further adapted to register with the service node in association with the second address when the wired connection via the first interface is not available (Fig. 6, paragraph 0090).

Regarding claims 6 and 24, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 4 and 22.

Fukushima teaches the control system is further adapted to register with the service node in association with the second address prior to the wired connection via the first interface becoming unavailable (paragraph 0090).

Regarding claims 7 and 25, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 4 and 22.

Fukushima teaches the control system is further adapted to register with the service node in association with the second address prior to initiating local wireless communications via the second interface (paragraph 0090).

Regarding claims 8 and 26, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 3 and 22.

Fukushima teaches the control system is further adapted to obtain the first address after detecting an ability to communicate via the first communication interface, and obtain the second address after detecting an ability to communicate via the second communication interface (paragraph 0090).

Regarding claims 9 and 27, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Fukushima teaches the first communication interface is a docking interface adapted to couple to a docking station, which connects to the first communication network such that the wired connection is facilitated through the docking station (paragraph 0090).

Regarding claims 10 and 28, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 9 and 27.

Fukushima teaches the first communication interface further comprises a network interface coupled to the docking interface (paragraph 0090).

Regarding claims 11 and 29, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 9 and 27.

Fukushima teaches the docking station comprises a network interface (10 of Fig. 4).

Regarding claims 12 and 30, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the control system is further adapted to:

- a) establish a first session for a communication with an entity via the first interface, the first session identified with the first indicia associated with the communication (paragraph 0090 of Fukushima, paragraph 0031 of Cherry et al.);
- b) determine communications via the first interface will no longer be possible (S107 of Fig. 7, paragraph 0090); and

c) initiate and establish a second session for the communication with the entity via the second interface, the second session identified with the first indicia (paragraph 0090 of Fukushima, paragraph 0031 of Cherry et al.).

Regarding claims 13 and 31, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 12 and 30.

Fukushima teaches determining communications via the first interface will no longer be possible, the control system is adapted to detect being removed from a docking station, which is coupled to the first communication network (Fig. 7).

Regarding claims 14 and 32, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 12 and 30.

Fukushima teaches determining communications via the first interface will no longer be possible, the control system is adapted to detect being removed from being directly coupled to the first communication network (Fig. 7).

Regarding claims 15 and 33, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 12 and 30.

Fukushima teaches determining communications via the first interface will no longer be possible, the control system is adapted to detect a signal sent from a docking station, which is coupled to the first communication network and coupled to the mobile terminal (Fig. 7).

Regarding claims 16 and 34, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 12 and 30.

Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the control system is further adapted to:

- a) determine communications via the first interface are available (Fig. 8 of Fukushima); and
- b) initiate and establish a third session for the communication with the entity via the first interface, the third session for the communication identified with the first indicia (S210-S211 of Fig. 8 of Fukushima; paragraph 0031 of Cherry et al.).

Regarding claims 17 and 35, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 12 and 30.

Fukushima teaches the first session is associated with a first address for the mobile terminal and the second session is associated with a second address for the mobile terminal (Figs 7-8, paragraph 0090).

3. Claims 18 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukushima (US2002/0038400) in view of Cherry et al. (US2005/0198069) and Frelburger et al. (US Patent#6475146).

Regarding claims 18 and 36, Fukushima and Cherry et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 19.

But, Fukushima and Cherry et al. do not expressly disclose further comprising providing a cellular interface operatively associated with the control system to facilitate cellular communications.

Frelburger et al. teach a mobile terminal and method comprising providing a cellular interface operatively associated with the control system to facilitate cellular communications (column 6 line 49 to column 7 line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate cellular interface taught by Frelburger et al. into the modified mobile terminal and method of Fukushima and Cherry et al., in order to facilitate telephony service.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2618

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zhiyu Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-2837.

The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays: 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on (571) 272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Zhiyu Lu
April 4, 2007

N. R. M.
NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER